

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,184	08/06/2003	Murali M. Karamchedu	109166-130890	9182
	7590 11/28/200 ILLIAMSON & WYA	EXAMINER		
PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900 1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE PORTLAND, OR 97204			ENG, DAVID Y	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/635,184	KARAMCHEDU ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	DAVID Y. ENG	2155			
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a not will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI ute, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19	September 2007.				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ Th	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	ance except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to the merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under	r <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.[). 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) 1 and 3-48 is/are pending in the ap	plication.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdo	•				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-48</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	/or election requirement.				
Application Papers		•			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a		by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	ne drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ection is required if the drawing	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreigna) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
1. Certified copies of the priority docume					
2. Certified copies of the priority docume		• •			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pr		received in this National Stage			
application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a li	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	traceived			
See the attached detailed Office action for a n	st of the certified copies hot	Teceived.			
Attachment(s)	, -	O			
1) Motice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Dotice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date			
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of I	Informal Patent Application			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim 2 has been cancelled. The active claims are 1, and 3-48.

Specification

Summary of the invention is missing.

In line 21 of page 12, there is no "send button 310" shown in the drawing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, 1st paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1 and 3-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The independent claims call for a computer implemented method. However, the steps shown in Figures 4a, 4b and 4c and claimed in the independent claims are implemented by a human. The specification fails to disclose the computer implemented processes to replace the corresponding human implemented steps shown in Figure 4.

The term "automatically" in the claims has not support in the specification.

Although the term "automatically" appears in the specification, there are no computer

Art Unit: 2155

implemented processes disclosed to support the term. The steps as disclosed are performed manually by a human and not automatically without human intervention. See Figure 4a-4c for example. A user selects and identifies the name "Bob Jones" from a message having a plurality of words. The user realizes that the selected words "Bob Jones" is a patent name and therefore selects a qualifier "patent name" from a plurality of qualifiers (415) and associates "Bob Jones" with "patent name". There is no disclosure as to how a computer is able to do that automatically. The processes shown in Figures 7 and 8 are purported implemented by a computer. However, the processes are no different than the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, 2nd paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 7-9, 18-19, 21, 31-33, 42-43, 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Scope of limitation of the rejected claims is not clear. Applicants are requested to identify the support in the specification and drawings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2155

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim1 and 3-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris (USP 7,028,075) in view of Meyerzon (USP 6,199,081).

Claims 1, 3, 4, 10-12; 13-16; 20, 22-24; 25-28, 34-36; 37-40; 44, 46-48

See column 5 lines 34-38 in Morris. Morris teaches creating an HTML email message. Morris does not teach that HTML email contains embedded metatags.

In column 1 lines 35-44, Meyerzon teaches that HTML documents contain metadata and metatags (semantic qualifiers). Meyerzon further teaches that metadata is data about data and metatags define the meta-data. Meyerzon also gives examples of metatags such as "author" and "language". HTML email message is a HTML document. From the teaching of Meyerzon, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to readily recognize that portions of HTML email messages of Morris are associated with metatags (semantic qualifiers) and embedded in the HTML email messages to provide contextulization.

As to the claims directed to sections of an email, all emails have header and body sections.

Claims 5-6; 17; 29-30; 41;

Standardized data models such as XML Schema, HL7 and CDA are well known in the art.

Claims 7-9; 18-19; 21; 31-33; 42-43; 45

Art Unit: 2155

It is well known that metatags can be used for searching and generating collections of tagged elements in a HTML document.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 13, 20, 25, 37 and 44 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID Y. ENG whose telephone number is 571-272-3984. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8AM to 3PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, SALEH NAJJAR, can be reached on 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DAVID Y. ENG PRIMARY EXAMINER